

Cherie Sachiel-Flint, B.S., D.C., F.I.C.P.A., A.C.N.  
336 Center Rd., Apt. 22B  
Vernon, CT 06066  
[flintstones4@att.net](mailto:flintstones4@att.net); ph. 860-871-1102

March 16, 2010

The Honorable Representative Ritter and Senator Harris, and  
Public Health Committee Members  
CT General Assembly  
Hartford, CT

RE: Raised Senate Bill 428; Section 13. Subsection (c) of section 20-27 of the 2010 supplement to the general statutes substitution

Dear Madam, Sir and Members,

Below you will find my suggestions for amending the proposed substitution to the above Bill. I am proposing this because other doctors, like myself, had their applications denied in 2009 and probably some this year, due to not having Part IV of the National Board Examination practical which wasn't in existence when I graduated), but had plenty of experience to substitute for a "Clinical Competency Examination".

I am asking for all those applications to be reviewed and grandfathered per the date of the original application, when the applicants did have 5+ years of continuous time in practice and did have a current valid license in good standing. As for myself, per my testimony, I could not practice over the last year or so, because CT did not give me a license to do so, and I had to take a job at CVS just to pay bills. In addition, myself and one other doctor I know, were given a final "no" in July of last year, at the Chiropractic Board meeting, that our licenses wouldn't be accepted, and by that time I had let my Texas license go to "inactive" status, as I had no plans to move back to TX (my TX license was due earlier in the year).

I am not sure if what I've written below is sufficient jargon for this amendment, so please pardon my lack of legal lingo. I do hope, however, that it can be revised to allow it to be incorporated into the Bill.

I thank you again, for allowing me to present my testimony at the hearing, and I hope this Bill is accepted, not only for myself, but for other doctors out there who want to come to CT to practice, and be a benefit to CT both from a health perspective and from a business perspective.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above contact information.

Respectfully yours,

Cherie Sachiel-Flint, D.C.

Proposed Addition:

**Sec. 13. Subsection (c ) ...**

....and (4) for the applicants whose licensure was denied in the year 2009 to the present date, for the reason of a lack of a National Board Part IV examination, but do in fact, have at least 5 years continuous experience prior to their application, their application will be grandfathered into this Bill, and reviewed per the date of their original application, with all other conditions met at that time . This includes applicants living in CT, due to their denial of CT chiropractic licensure in CT, could not practice continuously and/or had let their out-of-state license expire, they also will have their application grandfathered and their application will be reviewed per the date of their original application, provided there has been no professional disciplinary action pending over the time period of lapse, nor is the subject of an unresolved complaint.